

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Application No. 09/769,530
Attorney Docket No. 010032

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-16 are allowed. Claim 8 is amended. No new subject matter is added. It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated January 31, 2006.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Venkatraman* (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,487) in view of *Tang* (U.S. Patent No. 6,160,629). To expedite prosecution, Applicants hereby amend claim 8 to clarify the subject matter of the present invention. In view of this amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that claim 8 be allowed.

In rejecting claim 8, the Examiner acknowledged that *Venkatraman* fails to disclose “the conversion of this data before printing.” However, the Examiner asserted that *Tang* discloses “in column 4, lines 38-63 a description of the job retention functionality of a printer. Specifically, lines 48-50 discloses that the print job may or may not be stored as a rasterized file (i.e., that it is previously converted to imaging data prior to printing).”

However, *Tang* merely discloses that a printer may store a print job as a rasterized file. *Tang* does not teach or suggest a printer that *converts the data into imaging data before receiving a print execution command*. [claim 8].

Even if one were to combine the cited references, the resultant combination would suffer the problems described, for example, on page 3, lines 2-11 in the specification of the above-identified application. *See*, page 27, line 21 to page 28, line 6. In other words, the combination

Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Application No. 09/769,530
Attorney Docket No. 010032

would not result in a printer that converts the data of the Web page imaging data before receiving the print execution command, *e.g.*, only a printer that stores the print file as a rasterized file based on a print job.

Accordingly, the Examiner has failed to produce a *prima facie* case of obviousness and the rejection of claim 8 should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Darrin A. Auito

Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 56,024
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

DAA/meu